



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,151	07/12/2001	John C. Evans	GME / 137	2466
26875	7590	01/22/2004		
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP 2700 CAREW TOWER 441 VINE STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202				
EXAMINER BECKER, DREW E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1761				

DATE MAILED: 01/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/904,151

Applicant(s)

EVANS ET AL.

Examiner

Drew E Becker

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-802)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4 and 6-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schey [Pat. No. 1,480,119] in view of Eason [Pat. No. 3,854,392] and Troiel [Pat. No. 1,630,644].

Schey teaches a roasting device and method comprising a housing (page 2, lines 73-86), four vertically spaced, staggered, partially overlying, parallel, rotating spits which are fixed relative to the housing (Figure 1, #1-4), heaters and controls (Figure 1, #1a-4a), independent drive means (Figure 1, #74-76), and rotating the spits while applying heat (page 1, lines 8-14). Schey does not teach tiers of horizontal rollers, independently controlled heaters, and sidewalls supporting the roller tiers. Eason teaches a cooking device comprising a tier of horizontal, rotatable rollers attached to a spit (Figure 1, #13 & 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the roller tiers of Eason into the invention of Troiel since both are directed to grilling devices, since Schey already included rotatable spits (Figure 1, #1-4), and since Eason teaches that the roller tier was intended to convert typical spit-type rotisseries into devices for efficiently cooking wieners and sausages (abstract). Troiel teaches a rotisserie device comprising independently controlled heaters (Figure 1, #8-9) and sidewalls in the form

of sheet iron (Figure 3, #6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the gas cocks of Troiel into the invention of Schey, in view of Eason, since all are directed to rotisserie devices, since Schey already included multiple gas burners (Figure 1, #1a-4a), and since the gas cocks of Troiel would have permitted differing cooking conditions for each spit and thus increased cooking flexibility. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the sheet iron of Troiel into the invention of Schey since both are directed to cooking devices, since Schey already included an underlying frame and simply did not illustrate the covering (page 2, lines 73-86), and since the sheet iron sidewalls of Troiel would have helped strengthen and reinforce the frame of Schey while also covering the components and acting as a surface for insulation (Figure 3, #7).

3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schey, in view of Eason and Troiel, as applied above, and further in view of Hunot et al [Pat. No. 6,393,971].

Schey, Troiel, and Eason teach the above mentioned components. Schey, Troiel, and Eason do not teach an inclined roller tier. Hunot et al teach a cooking device comprising an inclined roller tier (Figure 10, #26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the inclined roller tier of Hunot et al into the invention of Schey, in view of Eason and Troiel, since all are directed to grilling devices, since Eason already included roller tiers (Figure 1, #13), and since the inclined roller tier of Hunot et al facilitated easier loading and unloading of hotdogs as well as a good view of the cooking process (column 4, line 64).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-

1396. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur. 8am-5pm and every other Fri. 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-0987.


Drew E Becker
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1761

1-15-04